REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a beam splitter. The beam splitter as claimed must be able to pass light from the first optical path on to be viewed and to pass that light on to the imaging array. The beam splitter must also be capable of passing light from the second optical system, both to the eyepiece and to the imaging array. Thus, the beam splitter must be able to take light from two different input directions and to pass that light, when received, in two different output directions.

While Abe is cited as teaching a beam splitter, it should be apparent that the beam splitter of Abe is not capable of the operation necessary to meet the limitation of claim 1. Namely, Abe simply receives one input light and provides one output light. While the Examiner notes that Abe could be positioned near the output of the cited reference to Labaziewicz, even if that were so (and anything is possible) it still would not meet the limitation of the claimed invention. That is because in such case, there would only be one input direction and two output directions. In other words, input light would always come in one direction and would be output in two directions. With the claimed system, light is received from two different angles and output at two different angles.

The objections to form have been corrected by appropriate amendments.

The application should now be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 9, 2004

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]